

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the elected claims and the remarks set forth fully below. In the Office Action dated November 26, 2008, claims 1-5, 9-10, 14, 17, 20-22, 36-38, 60-63, 78 and 91 have been subject to a restriction requirement. In response, the applicants elect Group I, claims 1-4, 9-10, 14 and 17 with traverse, drawn to a method of forming a security device having a transparent or translucent layer and reflective layer in permanently fixed disposition to each other.

Accordingly, the applicants have withdrawn Groups II and III, including claims 5, 20-22 and 36-38, and have cancelled Groups IV-VI, including claims 60-63, 78 and 91. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 9-10, 14 and 17 are now pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the elected claims and the remarks set forth fully below.

TRAVERSAL OF RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

The applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims 1, 5 and 20 include the inventive concept of blind embossing through a substantially transparent or translucent layer. The applicants further submit that the dependent claims 21, 22 and 36-38, as dependent upon independent claim 20, also share this inventive concept.

While claim 5 differs from claim 1 in that the reflective layer is applied to the substantially transparent or translucent layer after the blind embossing step, whereas in claim 1 the reflective layer has already been applied to the transparent or translucent layer, both of these independent claims arrive at the result of a transitory embossed image formed in the reflective layer through a substantially transparent or translucent layer. This is further embodied in the security device claim of the independent claim 20.

Therefore, the applicants once again respectfully submit that the grounds for traversal of the restriction requirement in this matter are predicated upon the fact that Groups I-III, and the claims embodied in these groups, are all directed towards blind embossing through a substantially transparent or translucent layer, that form a single


Applicant: Sani MUKE; Wayne Kevin JACKSON
Attorney Docket No.: 5141-00001

general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1, and further in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.499. The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider his restriction requirement accordingly.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at 414-271-7590 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

By 
Christopher M. Scherer
Reg. No. 50,655

Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall, LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 271-7590